UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Creative Democracy — The Task Before Us
John Dewey

The Present World Crisis — *Ernest Caldecott*

The Need for Clear Thinking on the Question of War — *Curtis W. Reese*

Armistice Day and World Peace Day
S. O. Levinson

The Study Table
John Haynes Holmes

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 6

Chicago, November 20, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES F. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 87
Jottings—J. H. H. 89

ARTICLES—

Creative Democracy—The Task Before Us—JOHN DEWEY 90
The Present World Crisis—ERNEST CALDECOTT 92
The Need for Clear Thinking on the Question of War—CURTIS W. REESE 94
Armistice Day and World Peace Day—S. O. LEVINSON 95
On the Pacifist Front—III 96

POETRY—

They Who Take the Sword Shall Perish with the Sword—FANIA KRUGER 97

THE STUDY TABLE—

Book Reviews by John Haynes Holmes 98

THE FIELD—

An Over-Crowded Europe and an Empty Near East—*Christian Friends of Palestine* 86
Hitler's Big Mistake—*The Western Jewish Advocate* 100

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

An Over-Crowded Europe and an Empty Near East

Congestion of population provides an excuse for aggression and expansion. It is generally conceded that Europe is in a turmoil because Europe is over-crowded.

In this over-crowded Europe, six million Jews are being libelled, besmirched, hounded, spoiled, tormented, massacred. Their wives and daughters violated, their synagogues sacked, their books burned, their holy scrolls —the tablets of the law—defiled. Their God—our God—the God of Christendom blasphemed. These Jews and their ancestors have lived in Europe for more than two thousand years, but now they must go as if they were aliens, pariahs, nomads. It is bootless to speak of justice, or to plead for mercy before the fiends of hell. Millions of Jews must emigrate. *Where shall they go?*

Various territories have been suggested as possible centers of colonization for Jews. An empty Near East, and especially Palestine as an actual center for Jewish colonization is the best answer to where they shall go. Why Palestine? Because in the last forty years the Jews have poured into the land $500,000,000 and 500,000 men, and have with their money, their sweat and their blood changed Palestine from a barren backward land to a fertile country, vying with the most progressive centers of modern civilization: Because the development of Palestine has opened up widened economic frontiers for the whole Near East. Because Palestine is the most readily accessible, easily reached country open for refugee colonization. Because Palestine historically has been the home of the Jewish people from the Bible times unto this day. Because fifty-two nations recognized this historic claim of the Jewish people to Palestine and solemnly affirmed the right of the Jews to settle there.

The successful development of Palestine by the Jews has amazed the world. The Palestine Royal Commission in the Report issued July, 1937, paid high tribute to the Jewish pioneer. The Jews achieved because of the latent qualities of the race, because they were driven by necessity, but above all, because they had returned to the land of their ancestors—Abraham, David, Isaiah, Judas Maccabeas.

What the Jews have achieved:

Some 240 agricultural settlements established in previously uncultivatable areas, made possible by draining and irrigation of otherwise waste lands and malarial swamps.

110,000 people settled on these lands.

Marked Urban development.

Building on the Mediterranean sands modern Tel Aviv, all Jewish city of 160,000 souls.

Haifa becomes important center of shipping and commercial enterprise.

More than 200 primary schools established in country districts.

(*Continued on page* 100)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, NOVEMBER 20, 1939 No. 6

UNIVERSAL PEACE

The darkness of this gloomy night shall pass away and the sun of Universal Peace will dawn.
Have patience, wait, but do not sit idle.
Work while you are waiting.
Be firm while everything around you is being shaken.
Be hopeful while the ugly face of despair grins at you.
Be valiant and courageous while men all around you are cringing with fear and cowardice.
Do not yield to the overwhelming power of despotism and war.
Diffuse the fragrance of the rose of reconciliation.

—Abdul Baha

ARMISTICE DAY AND THANKSGIVING DAY

Armistice Day has passed, with as little damage and as much benefit as may have been possible under the bitterly ironical circumstances of that date. In London, the traditional Whitehall ceremonies at the Cenotaph were given up, and in all probability will never be resumed again. What ashes in the mouths of the 1914-18 dead! In this country there were few public meetings, apart from meetings of veterans to whom the day is still precious, and gatherings surrounded by those who would keep America out of this second World War. Never in all the past twenty years was Armistice Day more fittingly observed than by this solemn resolve, "Never again." But now this agony is gone—and there fittingly comes the Thanksgiving festival. Whether observed on the 23rd, or the 30th, this is a glorious opportunity to lift up the hearts of the people in gratitude to God for his blessings, and to bind them anew in dedication to the high purposes of His holy will. Not that we should thank Him that we are prospering while other peoples of the world are perishing, that we are safe while others are in dire peril! That would be blasphemy of the most dreadful order. Rather should we thank God that we are here to serve Him and to save His children in any and every way that chance or choice may determine. We are fortunate among all great peoples that we are free—free to determine the policies of our government, free to achieve and cherish the interests of peace while other nations are helplessly engulfed in war, free to be friend to all countries and enemy to none, free to succor and serve the stricken multitudes of war-ravaged Europe, free to plot and plan for a speedy end to the devouring conflict by ways of reconciliation and adjustment, free to dream of the day when wars and rumors of wars will be no more, and to live for the coming of that day. This must be our Thanksgiving. Not a heedless feasting on material things, certainly not a heedless thanking that we are not as other men! But a petition that the favors of our lot, so often grossly abused, shall become, under God's guidance, a means to service and sacrifice for mankind! This year, whatever else we may do, we must seek out the altars of church and synagogue and there submit ourselves unto God.

THE NEW NEUTRALITY LAW

We are sorry that the embargo was lifted, but we are wasting no undue lamentation over the event. For we recognize that there are other provisions in this new Neutrality Law which make it one of the most enlightened pacifist measures ever written. Indeed, the net gain for peace in this legislation is so great that we are not sure that what seem to us to be the dangerous features of raising the embargo may not in the end be quite nullified. One has only to go back to the 1914 days when Americans were arrogantly insisting upon the right of American citizens to go anywhere they wanted to go in wartime, and the right of American ships to sail in any waters, to realize what it means to have a law on the statute-books forbidding Americans to sail on belligerent vessels, banning American ships from war areas, and laying down a "cash and carry" basis of trading with nations at war. This last section of the law is by all odds the most important. Coupled with the Johnson Act forbidding loans to debtor nations, it ought to go far indeed toward keeping the United States at peace. The President is to be thanked and congratulated for his leadership in welding this Neutrality Law firmly into the structure of our national life, and due recognition also should be given to Congress. Its debates, both in House and Senate, were on a high plane of dignity. The one sharp division on the embargo issue was an honest difference of opinion between sincere men seeking to preserve this country from the hazards of this present hour. We count it a blessed thing that this whole controversy was conducted with good feeling and without a trace of partisan bitterness. The government and the people seem united in the determination to keep America out of this war. Faithful to this determination, we shall all of us have what Mr. Roosevelt so graciously

wished for the members of Congress—"a happy Thanksgiving and a merry Christmas." Only one thing more is needed to bless these holidays, and this the most important thing of all—the ending at once of the European conflict!

ANTI-WAR SENTIMENT

How many people realize the extent and power of the anti-war sentiment that is rife in Europe. The censors see to it that we get mighty little news along this line, but the news is there and little by little trickles through. In Germany, it is difficult to get at the facts, since popular opinion is absolutely suppressed, but all testimony agrees that the people are in despair over the war, and would give anything to get out of it. In France, anti-war sentiment is running strong. One peace party, headed by an ex-Premier, is too influential to be attacked and disbanded by the government, as the Communists were. Elliott Paul, author of *Life and Death of a Spanish Town,* just back from Paris, reports that "Daladier knows his government would collapse in a month if he really started to fight." In England, the peace party is led by George Lansbury and Mr. Maxton in the House of Commons, and by Lord Arnold and Lord Ponsonby in the House of Lords. Lloyd George has his own peace party, called the Council of Action for Peace and Reconstruction, and is holding great meetings in Wales and elsewhere. Bernard Shaw has declared that the war should not last another hour. Sir George Trevelyan, England's most eminent historian, and Professor Joad, of Cambridge University, joined recently in writing a letter to the London *Times* urging the government to open up immediate negotiations for a speedy peace. It is all nonsense that the peoples of France and Britain are united in a determination to fight this war through to a final and decisive conclusion. The peoples, however grim in their resolve to stop Hitler, still want and would welcome peace. Even the governments of these countries would be glad to avoid further war, if only they could save their militaristic faces. Which is where the neutrals should come in, more particularly the United States, to help the belligerents to do what they cannot do for themselves! If we want peace, as we say we do, then we should implement this anti-war sentiment in all the warring nations, and therewith enable it to find expression and get to work. Match the anti-war sentiment of this country with the anti-war sentiment of England, France, and Germany, and the war could not last an hour.

THE POPE'S ENCYCLICAL

There seems to be no dissent to the proposition that Pope Pius XII's first Encyclical was a wonderful document, worthy not alone of the great church of which Pius is the head, but of the Christian gospel itself. In this utterance the Pope did more to place himself at the head of the Christian world than if he had enforced acceptance of Christ at the peril of sword and stake. Here we see the sheer power of thought and spirit to master the allegiance of mankind. Now we know that the Papacy, and the Christianity of which it is one of the noblest ornaments and instruments, will endure ages after the sword of Hitler has crumbled into dust. The pen is indeed mightier than the sword! The Encyclical was remarkable for many things. Not least for its affirmation of the sanctity of the individual as over against the power of the state—as also, of course, of the church! The church indeed is potent only as it recognizes and safeguards this concept of the spirit, and the state is not to be endured if it violates this concept. In proclaiming this principle, Pope Pius proclaimed nothing new, but reinforced the claims of democracy everywhere from Ireland to India, and in the face alike of Germany and Italy, Russia, and Japan. More vital still, it seems to us, was the Pope's declaration that the world is perishing fundamentally because of its neglect and even defiance of religion, and of the august moral standards that are implicit in religion. This reminder of things spiritual is a challenge not alone to Nazi Germany and Communist Russia, but to every land, our own included, which has gone mad over the crassly materialistic forces of our age. If we are being destroyed by a war machine too terrible even to imagine, is it for any other reason than that we have become obsessed by mechanism, and will barter anything, even our souls, for one more gadget? It is not only the Communists in the Soviet Republic who are trying the vast experiment of living without God. If they are denying him, we are forgetting or ignoring him. And the result, as Pius XII inexorably affirms, is the collapse of a society which has no principles but its own pleasure, and seeks no purpose but the power of earthly dominion. The Nazi newspapers published not a word of the Encyclical, for reasons too obvious to name. Whether the Soviets allowed their people to know that the Pope had spoken, we do not know. We at least have heard. Whether we shall do anything about it is another question.

BRITAIN AND INDIA

It is amazing that the idea should be spread abroad that Gandhi is repudiating his non-resistance ideals and giving his support to Britain's imperialistic war. This whole idea, of course, is utterly false, save as it represents a deliberate attempt on the Mahatma's part to meet Britain's impudence in proposing that India should support the Empire in the European struggle, and to show the hollowness of Britain's claim to be the champion of democracy and freedom. This is the story! At the outbreak of the war Britain turned to India, as to the rest of the Empire, for help. "What!" said Gandhi, in effect, "help Britain when Indians are bond-

slaves to the British crown! Will you give us independence if we fight? Surely, if the war is for democracy, you must give to us what you are fighting to save for others." Here was a dilemma! Gandhi, with his customary shrewdness, had put Britain right "on the spot." Did she mean democracy, or did she not? Gandhi's query, backed by the Congress, met with a long silence. Finally, there came a reply from the Viceroy to the effect that, if India would be good and send her sons to the battlefront, Britain would consider granting dominion status after the war. *After the war!* Did the Viceroy not remember the promises made by Lloyd George in the last war, promises of freedom if Indians would fight, and all of them repudiated the moment the war was over? Well, Gandhi and the Congress remembered. The Congress exploded in consternation and disgust. Gandhi, characteristically patient, declared that the Viceroy's statement was deeply disappointing, but in no sense final. The doors were still wide open to negotiation. Then came the master stroke—the resignations of the eight governments in the provinces controlled by the Congress, with the awful threat of a new campaign of civil disobedience in the background. The situation in India is formidable. It has been developed by Gandhi with consummate skill. It must result in a victory speedier and more decisive than India hitherto has dared hope. But in his attitude toward force and violence, and war, the Mahatma remains unchanged. Such a soul stands fixed, like the stars in the firmament of heaven.

WORLD'S FAIRS

It is remarkable, when you come to think of it, that the New York and the San Francisco World's Fairs should have been held at all—and stupid that they should have been held in competition in the same year. With the world itself in torment, and at last breaking out into the crazed hysteria of the war, the Fairs still went on, and registered under the conditions amazing success. Both, of course, were disappointed from the viewpoint of their anticipations. Thus, the San Francisco Exposition is something over four million dollars in debt. The financial condition of the World of Tomorrow is not known, but drastic economies at the expense of the workers and concessions on the part of the bondholders and other creditors are probably the basis of the assurance that all obligations will be met. The great disappointment in New York was the attendance—some twenty-five millions instead of the sixty millions so confidently estimated at the start. The trouble here was simply and solely extravagant expectations. Why should anybody in his senses have cherished the illusion that even in New York a world's fair would attract an attendance of nearly half the population of the United States? What was ever crazier than that feverish announcement on the opening day that a million people were going to crowd the grounds—an announcement so terrifying that everybody stayed at home. Then came desperate—and unscrupulous—attempts to pad the figures, hectic experiments at cut-rate prices, mardi gras fiestas, and all the ballyhoo features that circus-minded managers could think of. But the attendance hung steadily around the average of eighty to a hundred thousand visitors a day, with huge holiday and week-end crowds, which ought to have been enough to suit anybody but a Grover Whalen. The New York Fair was an impressive exhibition and a gorgeous entertainment—all in all, a stupendous achievement. As a spectacle of "the world of tomorrow," however, it was depressing. It was machinery run mad—the vision of a society utterly reduced to mere mechanism. In all that vast array of wonders yet to come, there was hardly a suggestion of the deeper and truer things of life—those intangibles and imponderables that make men to be *men* and not robots. The makers of the Fair evidently believed that the materialistic tendencies of our time are destined to be triumphant—and here was what they would come to! It certainly was breathtaking, but also horrifying.

Jottings

Are we ashamed of this word, "pacifist"? We are not! What word has a nobler lineage or a sublimer meaning? Turn to the Latin translation of the New Testament, the Beatitudes, Matthew V, 9th verse:

> "Beati pacifici, quoniam ipsi filii
> Dei vocabuntur."
> Pacifici, *pacifists,* PEACEMAKERS!
> "Blessed are the pacifists, for they shall
> be called the sons of God."

Maugham, Milne, de la Mare—is there not some reason for our constantly getting these three distinguished English authors mixed up?

"Can Satan drive out Satan?" Apparently he can, Scripture to the contrary notwithstanding. For here we read that Hitler has banished the playing of swing music from all of Germany!

Put it down to the credit of the New York World's Fair that there were no military displays—no exhibitions of tanks, bombing planes, machine guns, gas masks, and other paraphernalia of war. The directors

of the Fair evidently did not see these things in "the world of tomorrow." Which may God grant!

"Business does not want war because the profits are too small to offset the disruption of industry." Statement (quoted in the New York *Times*) before the National Association of Manufacturers.

Which being interpreted means that if the profits were *not* too small, business *would* want war! But the profits in munitions are enormous and never disrupt the industry—which explains why munitions manufacturers *do* want war!

Horses used in bullfights in Spain are now given injections of morphine, so that they won't suffer when gored. Great idea! Why not inject all inhabitants of great European cities with morphine, so that they won't suffer when bombed?

J. H. H.

Creative Democracy—The Task Before Us*

JOHN DEWEY

Under present circumstances I cannot hope to conceal the fact that I have managed to exist eighty years. Mention of the fact may suggest to you a more important fact—namely, that events of the utmost significance for the destiny of this country have taken place during the past four-fifths of a century, a period that covers more than half of its national life in its present form. For obvious reasons I shall not attempt a summary of even the more important of these events. I refer here to them because of their bearing upon the issue to which this country committed itself when the nation took shape—the creation of democracy, an issue which is now as urgent as it was a hundred and fifty years ago when the most experienced and wisest men of the country gathered to take stock of conditions and to create the political structure of a self-governing society.

For the net import of the changes that have taken place in these later years is that ways of life and institutions which were once the natural, almost the inevitable, product of fortunate conditions have now to be won by conscious and resolute effort. Not all the country was in a pioneer state eighty years ago. But it was still, save perhaps in a few large cities, so close to the pioneer stage of American life that the traditions of the pioneer, indeed of the frontier, were active agencies in forming the thoughts and shaping the beliefs of those who were born into its life. In imagination at least the country was still having an open frontier, one of unused and unappropriated resources. It was a country of physical opportunity and invitation. Even so, there was more than a marvelous conjunction of physical circumstances involved in bringing to birth this new nation. There was in existence a group of men who were capable of readapting older institutions and ideas to meet the situations provided by new physical conditions —a group of men extraordinarily gifted in political inventiveness.

At the present time, the frontier is moral, not physical. The period of free lands that seemed boundless in extent has vanished. Unused resources are now human rather than material. They are found in the waste of grown men and women who are without the chance to work, and in the young men and young women who find doors closed where there was once opportunity. The crisis that one hundred and fifty years ago called out social and political inventiveness is with us in a form which puts a heavier demand on human creativeness.

At all events this is what I mean when I say that we now have to create by deliberate and determined endeavor the kind of democracy which in its origin one hundred and fifty years ago was largely a gift of grace, the product of a fortunate combination of circumstances. We have lived for a long time upon the heritage that came to us from the happy conjunction of men and events in an earlier day. The present state of the world is more than a reminder that we have now to put forth every energy of our own to prove worthy of our heritage. It is a challenge to do for the critical and complex conditions of today what the men of an earlier day did for simpler conditions.

If I emphasize that the task can be accomplished only by inventive effort and creative activity, it is in part because the depth of the present crisis is due in considerable part to the fact that for a long period we acted as if our democracy were something that perpetuated itself automatically; as if our ancestors had succeeded in setting up a machine that had solved the problem of perpetual motion in politics. We acted as if democracy were something that took place mainly at Washington and Albany—or some other state capital —under the impetus of what happened when men and women went to the polls once a year or so—which is a somewhat extreme way of saying that we were in the habit of thinking of democracy as a kind of political mechanism that would work as long as citizens were reasonably faithful in performing political duties.

Of late years we have heard more and more frequently that this is not enough; that democracy is a way of life. This saying gets down to hard pan. But I am not sure that something of the externality of the old idea does not cling to the new and better statement. In any case we can escape from this external way of thinking only as we realize in thought and act that democracy is a *personal* way of individual life; that it signifies the possession and continual use of certain attitudes, forming personal character, and determining desire and purpose in all the relations of life. Instead of thinking of our own dispositions and habits as accommodated to certain institutions we have to learn to think of the latter as expressions, projections, and extensions of habitually dominant personal attitudes.

Democracy as a personal, an individual, way of life involves nothing fundamentally new. But when applied it puts a new practical meaning in old ideas. Put into effect it signifies that powerful present enemies of democracy can be successfully met only by the creation of personal attitudes in individual human beings, so that we must get over our tendency to think that its defense can be found in any external means whatever, whether military or civil, if they are separated from personal attitudes so deep-seated as to constitute personal character.

Democracy is a way of life controlled by a working

*A message presented at a banquet in New York City held in honor of John Dewey's eightieth birthday (October 20, 1939)—*Editor.*

faith in the possibilities of human nature. Belief in the Common Man is a familiar article in the democratic creed. That belief is without basis and significance save as it means faith in the potentialities of human nature as that nature is exhibited in every human being irrespective of race, color, sex, birth, and family, of material or cultural wealth. This faith may be enacted in statutes, but it is only on paper unless it is put in force in the attitudes which human beings display to one another in all the incidents and relations of daily life. To denounce Naziism for intolerance, cruelty, and stimulation of hatred amounts to fostering of insincerity if, in our personal relations to other persons, if, in our daily walk and conversation, we are moved by racial, color, or other class prejudice; indeed, by anything save a generous belief in their possibilities as human beings and hence in the need of providing conditions which will enable these capacities to reach fulfilment. The democratic faith in human equality is belief that every human being, independent of the quantity or range of his personal endowment, has the right to equal opportunity with every other person for development of whatever gifts he has. The democratic belief in the principle of leadership is a generous one. It is universal. It is belief in the capacity of every person to lead his own life free from coercion and imposition by others, provided right conditions are supplied.

Democracy is a way of personal life controlled not merely by faith in human nature in general but by faith in the capacity of human beings for intelligent judgment and action if proper conditions are furnished. I have been accused more than once and from opposed quarters of an undue, a utopian, faith in the possibilities of intelligence and in education as a correlate of intelligence. At all events, I did not invent this faith. I acquired it from my surroundings as far as those surroundings were animated by the democratic spirit. For what is the faith of democracy in the method of consultation, of conference, of persuasion, of discussion, in forming of public opinion which in the long run is self-corrective, except faith in the capacity of the intelligence of the common man to respond with common sense to the free play of facts and ideas which are secured by effective guaranties of free inquiry, free assembly, and free communication? I am willing to leave to upholders of totalitarian states of the right and the left the view that faith in the capacities of intelligence is utopian. For the faith is so deeply embedded in the methods which are intrinsic to democracy that when a professed democrat denies the faith he convicts himself of treachery to his profession.

When I think of the conditions under which men and women are living in many foreign countries today, fear of espionage, with danger hanging over the meeting of friends for friendly conversation in private gatherings, I am inclined to believe that the heart and final guaranty of democracy is in free gatherings of neighbors on the street corner to discuss back and forth what is read in uncensored news of the day, and in gatherings of friends in the living rooms of houses and apartments to converse freely with one another. Intolerance, abuse, calling of names because of differences of opinion about religion or politics or business, as well as because of differences of race, color, wealth, or degree of culture, are treason to the democratic way of life. For everything which bars freedom and fullness of communication sets up barriers which divide human beings into sets and cliques into antagonistic sects and factions, and the democratic way of life is undermined. Merely legal guaranties of the civil liberties of free belief, free expression, free assembly are of little avail if in daily life freedom of communication, of give and take of ideas, facts, experiences is choked by mutual suspicion, by abuse, by fear and by hatred. These destroy the essential condition of the democratic way of living even more effectually than open coercion which —as the example of totalitarian states proves—is effective only when it succeeds in breeding hate, suspicion, intolerance in the minds of individual human beings.

Finally, given the two conditions just mentioned, democracy as a way of life is controlled by personal faith in personal day-by-day working together with others. Democracy is the belief that even when needs and ends or consequences are different for each individual, the habit of amicable coöperation—which may include, as in sport, rivalry and competition—is itself a priceless addition to life. To take as far as possible every conflict which arises—and they are bound to arise out of the atmosphere and medium of force, of violence as a means of settlement—into that of discussion and of intelligence is to treat those who disagree even profoundly with us as those from whom we may learn and, in so far, as friends. A genuinely democratic faith in peace is faith in the possibility of conducting disputes, controversies and conflicts as coöperative undertakings in which both parties learn by giving the other a chance to express itself, instead of having one party conquer by forceful suppression of the other—a suppression which is nonetheless one of violence when it takes place by psychological means of ridicule, abuse, intimidation, instead of by overt imprisonment or concentration camps. To coöperate by giving differences a chance to show themselves in the belief that the expression of difference is not only a right of the other persons but is a means of enriching one's own life-experience, is inherent in the democratic personal way of life.

If what has been said is charged with being a set of moral commonplaces, my only reply is that that is just the point in saying them. For to get rid of the habit of thinking of democracy as something institutional and external and to acquire the habit of treating it as a way of personal life is to realize that democracy is a moral ideal and so far as it becomes a fact is a moral fact. It is to realize that democracy is a reality only as it is indeed a commonplace of living.

Since my adult years have been given to the pursuit of philosophy, I shall ask your indulgence if in concluding I state briefly the democratic faith in the formal terms of a philosophic position. So stated, democracy is belief in the ability of human experience to generate the aims and methods by which further experience will grow in ordered richness. Every other form of moral and social faith rests upon the idea that experience must be subjected at some point or other to some form of external control; to some "authority" alleged to exist outside the processes of experience. Democracy is the faith that the process of experience is more important than any special result attained, so that special results achieved are of ultimate value only as they are used to enrich and order the ongoing process. Since the process is thus capable of being educative, faith in democracy is all one with faith in experience and education. All ends and values that are cut off from the ongoing process become arrests, fixations. They strive to fixate what has been gained instead of using it to open the road and point the way to new and better experiences.

If one asks what is meant by experience in this

connection my reply is that it is the free interaction of individual human beings with surrounding conditions, especially the human surroundings, which develops and satisfies need and desire by increasing knowledge of things as they are. Knowledge of conditions as they are is the only solid ground for communication and sharing; all other communication means the subjection of some persons to the personal opinion of other persons. Need and desire—out of which grow purpose and direction of energy—go beyond what exists, and hence beyond knowledge, beyond science. It continually opens the way into the unexplored and unattained future.

Democracy as compared with other ways of life is the sole way of living which believes wholeheartedly in the process of experience as end and as means; as that which is capable of generating the science which is the sole dependable authority for the direction of further experience and which releases emotions, needs, and desires, that call into being the things which have not existed in the past. For every way of life that fails in its democracy limits the contacts, the exchanges, the communications, the interactions by which experience is steadied while it is also enlarged and enriched. The task of this release and enrichment is one that has to be carried on day by day. Since it is one that can have no end till experience itself comes to an end, the task of democracy is forever that of creation of a freer and more humane experience in which all share and to which all contribute.

The Present World Crisis

ERNEST CALDECOTT

The thoroughgoing pacifist must have a relatively easy time in these days compared with the rest of us, especially those who are as conscientious as he is, but a little more realistic. The pacifist has decided that war under any circumstances is wrong and that he will have none of it. He prefers the concentration camp to any form of participation. The problem is as settled for him as that two and two make four. He insists that a nation at war with any other nation, for any reason whatsoever, is basically different from that of an individual or gang plundering a house or a bank at the point of a gun. He will neither attack nor defend.

As one who believes in freedom of conscience I would neither deny a pacifist the right to so declare himself nor penalize him in any way for doing so. The practical affairs of a nation may necessitate certain prescribed rules under which the pacifist must be registered in order to detect him from the sheer coward. He should not expect to step into a lucrative position occupied by a man who, just as conscientiously, had volunteered for service and to retain that position when the combatant returned from duty.

What troubles me is that personal pacifism, like personal anarchism, is ineffective. The war goes on. The pacifist may even engage in those economic practices, or be a beneficiary of such acts, as are largely contributory to war. He may, for example, draw his salary or income, directly, or indirectly, from predatory interests which, in their totality, lead to internecine strife. While his position appears clear to him it is filled with inconsistencies to me. My heart is with him, but, again, the war goes on.

Another predicament from which we must attempt to extricate ourselves is that of distinguishing between wars. Admittedly, all wars are wrong. They violate every sound principle of human living. But can we really put the American Revolutionary War, the Boer War, the American and the Spanish Civil Wars all on the same footing? Nor is such questioning to make us mere opportunists. What it will lead us to later on is consideration of the causes and cure of war.

Let a few facts be cited to illustrate the difficulty with which the non-pacifist but peace-loving citizen is confronted. The Treaty of Versailles was a dictated peace. It might well have been that had the World War continued another six months or so, Germany would have been beaten into unconditional surrender. In that event no Hitler could now be complaining. But the artificial carving up of land would have brought no peace. A different war would now, or at some future time, be waging. Instead of a war to smash "Hitlerism" the slogan would be something else.

Then there are those who urge that Europe return to a pre-world war basis, with Germany receiving her colonies as of 1914, and the status quo for other nations, with an honest (sic) plebescite whereby each group decides for itself where, if anywhere, it shall belong. But the question arises, "Why begin with 1914?" Did that start European history or begin its downfall?

Again, what about Spain? Ought or ought not the nations which aided on both sides make reparation for damage done?

Other instances come readily to mind when we go back a few decades. At first blush they appear to support the pacifists' position. And they would if only such persons were better known for a complete program. It is probably their own fault that they are not, since they themselves make their refusal to participate in war the most prominent plank in their platform.

At this point all peace lovers can join. With all the differences that may exist among us we are unanimous both in opposing war and in advocating the conference method of settling disputes.

War does not settle the issues that provoke it. Nor are nations in a mood to arrange a just peace immediately following bloody strife. This at once suggests an impartial body to adjudicate between disputing nations. In turn, this means abandoning the childish notion of national sovereignty. No human being is a sovereign; why should the group regard itself as such? The President of the United States can be impeached. The King of England can be forced to abdicate. Hitler dictates, not because of any personal superiority to a whole nation, but due to its abject condition. It is as sensible to inaugurate an International Court of Justice as to institute civil courts. Whether this shall be a League of Nations, a United Nations of the World (beginning with Streit's "Union Now" plan) or some other arrangement could be determined at a World Conference. Some kind of conference will settle the present dispute no matter how long it lasts, unless Germany should win while Hitler is in power,

in which event he will make the much-condemned Versailles Treaty look like Paradise.

Lest some readers may have become enamored with the "Moral Rearmament" movement, it will be well to make brief comment on it at this point. No sincere reader of UNITY could possibly cavil at the urgent necessity of sound ethical behavior in human relations. But advocates of "MRA" seem largely oblivious of economic and political involvements. Not a few names of those prominently connected with the movement are tories of the deepest dye. They are among the strongest proponents of the economic status quo. The very practices in which they (legally) engage in business are those most calculated to bring nations into war. Granting their utter sincerity, they are then self-deluded. And "if the blind lead the blind both shall fall into the pit."

We shall go on from war to war until we bring about at least four sets of conditions. Two of them are covered by the above remarks; one is an International Court, or something akin thereto; the other is personal conduct, which appears to be what the "MRA" is seeking.

The other two conditions involve the equal rights of small nations with large ones, and the internationalizing of natural resources.

Woodrow Wilson's plea for the "self-determination of nations" was sound. Honest plebescites need to be arranged. If human life is worth having at all, every person must be given a reasonable opportunity to govern himself. This is not as easy as may appear on the surface. For example, the above statement cannot be taken literally. If it were we might find some peoples in Europe or Asia expressing a desire to live in the United States. But until we have absorbed the polyglot we now have, we cannot put ourselves in a position to help the world. One has only to travel the length and breadth of our country a few times to be appalled at the task of Americanization in its broadest sense. Ignorance and prejudice stalk the land. To open our gates without discrimination would increase our problem and do little for many years to aid the vast majority who would come here.

What is meant by "self-determination" for the time being is that the members of existing nations shall decide, without outside influence, upon their own form of government, including whether they wish to be a "protectorate" of another country. One wonders what would happen in Russia and in Germany if they held a really honest election without threat or fear. It is difficult enough to get it at times in our own country. But that is the direction in which the nations should move. An International Court might well assist to this end.

The fourth condition is more important than all the others combined, although partly dependent upon several of them. Most wars are for purposes of improving standards of living. While not denying the existence of other factors, such as intense nationalism, economics stands out as the greatest single deterrent in the cause of peace. It has been argued, times without number, that man is a selfish animal and will fight for what he wants. All through history we note raids by one tribe on another to take away its possessions. Practically all the movements of the Hebrew people portrayed in the Bible are descriptive of efforts to improve their lot in life. Nomadic people went from place to place seeking better forage for themselves or their cattle. And so the story goes on to modern times, with an occasional religious war to add fuel to the flames.

Moreover, it is to be noted that when national leaders declare war for economic reasons they are not primarily concerned for the masses. Rather do they recognize that they cannot "get blood out of a turnip." Britain's exploitation of India has been only indirectly for the benefit of the people of England. America's tariff has been imposed for the profit of a few. That others have gained was a mere necessary incident and not a primary motive.

The demand for a "more abundant life" rarely comes from those who most need it. They are largely docile. The hungry masses of Germany, again doomed to misery unless the present war comes to an early close, did not call for a Hitler. He is still the servant of the Junker class.

But, happily, this is not the whole story. If socio-economic conditions produce those who prey upon peoples and lead to wars, changed conditions may abolish them. We err in spending so much time condemning individual men, even though it is true that men produce conditions. All too frequently are the men brought into being by the conditions. Not for a single day should we cease to endeavor to improve our own personal behavior in social situations, nor relax our efforts in stating reasons why others should do similarly. But if we build bridges one hundred feet high and do not erect walls on both sides, even good and normal people will fall to their death. Modern international and economic life is comparable to the high bridge which needs walls. If people insist upon committing suicide, nothing can prevent their doing so. But it would be communal homicide to leave bridges unprotected.

The time has arrived, and is now overdue, for erecting reasonable social protection because of the type of life we have elected to live. It is unnecessary to assert that man is not selfish, except a few. This would not be true even if it were made. But it is easy to observe how many become harmfully selfish when placed in certain positions. Their nature has not changed; circumstances have made all the difference.

The economic explanation of our woes, as pure materialism in the Marxist sense, is not satisfactory. The psycho-socio-economic theory is much truer to reality. Were man an automaton, not subject to influences of a mental and social character, pure intelligence (if we can conceive of such without psycho-social situations) might then develop a solely materialistic economics. Actually, however, we find human beings responding quite well to reasonable changes when generally applied. They object to unfair discrimination.

The reasonable tractability of man to decent forms of living is perfectly apparent. Take, for example, the system of controlling traffic in modern cities. Certainly less than one per cent of motorists refuse to heed the signals. When they stop functioning, a traffic jam quickly results. The drivers are the same persons they were a minute before. The lights off, and enough of them will take as much of the road as they can get. A slightly changed circumstance has made all the difference. When a rail is erected at the ticket office of a theatre, practically everyone will stand in line without a policeman to enforce the rule. Take the rail away and the same persons will crowd in to get their tickets.

In short, we make too much of the "human na-

ture" plea. A few changes in the economic rules of the game would do more to promote the peace than any other factor that can be mentioned. Those who love power and who seek to flatter their ego through possession, and what Thorstein Veblen called "conspicuous consumption," could easily be controlled. They are where they are because present rules favor them, just as bankers have power because of laws and not because of any inherent superiority of their own.

It will probably hurt our ego just a little when it is suggested that the United States make its natural resources available to all the world. We are not recommending that we give away what we ourselves are not using. We are urging that since, as a people, we have not paid for the iron, coal, oil and other deposits, and are not using them up, if, to allow their appropriation in terms of previously agreed-upon rules, we can assist in promoting peace, it is as sensible to do so as it is to have street signals to regulate traffic.

The United States may possibly have one further way out for itself. It is isolation. That, however, is not ethical, and if we adopt it as a policy we may rue the day, for the world is getting smaller every year, thanks to science.

To recapitulate: we gladly pay tribute to the pacifist, but assert that the war goes on. We must not lump all wars together without distinction on the theory, sound enough in itself, that all war is wrong. An International Court of Justice must be inaugurated. The rights of small nations must be respected. And, most important of all, we should internationalize natural resources. These things can be done. It would be better for unofficial but reliable groups to begin them than for governments to do so, thus bringing about changes from the people rather than from their rulers.

Finally, I reiterate a suggestion and a plea which I have made from time to time in recent years, and in behalf of which I shall feel compelled to work myself unless some more well-known person does so. What finer service could the churches render to this world than for the ranking officers of the denominations to spend many days together, with expert assistance, discussing the minimum bases of peace? That agreed upon, take the idea to the leaders of religious life in other countries. A year is a short time in which to work out a program, and it might well save disaster. Certainly, it is worth trying, and is infinitely better than prayers in church for peace. Let us discover how serious we are about peace when it is going to cost something. And let us consider the costs of war if we do not do something effective for peace. While not among the pessimists who think that a great war will mean the end of our civilization, I see its awful disaster to body, soul, and material. Now is the time to make an epochal contribution to the developing life of the world.

The Need for Clear Thinking on the Question of War

CURTIS W. REESE

Now, while minds are agitated on international questions, seems to me to be a good time to clarify our thinking on the subject of war. What to think on this question is a matter that cannot be settled by emotional outbursts, but by rigorous and fundamental thought. But this kind of thinking is not engaged in by those who favor war "at-the-drop-of-a-hat" nor by those who favor "peace at any price." Helpful thinking on the war question can be done only by those who look as objectively as possible at vital issues on which realistic decisions must be made. Opinion on war does not exist in vacuo. It is related and interrelated to all sorts of other issues and values.

There are, at least, two primary and two secondary questions on which we need to do clear thinking. The primary ones have to do with the nature of force and the nature of war; the secondary ones have to do with neutrality and with "taking sides."

1. *The Question of the Nature of Force.* To identify force as such with either goodness or badness is the beginning of confusion. Force is neither good nor bad. It derives its character from the use that is made of it, including both processes and ends. This is equally true whether we are dealing with physical force or with what is somewhat hazily called "soul force." Pascal was on the right track when he said: "Force without justice is tyrannical. Justice without force is impotent. . . . We must therefore combine justice and force, so that what is just may be strong, and what is strong may be just." It is essential to understand clearly that force in itself has no moral significance; that its character is derivative, not inherent.

2. *The Question of the Nature of War.* War is force plus violence, and so when considered as process is undoubtedly an evil. It cannot be successfully argued that war as such is a good. This, however, is not the same as saying that no good ever comes from war. To assert this would be to fly in the face of facts. Obviously, many good things have resulted from war, including the American government, the emancipation of a race, the Soviet Republic, and other like developments. Certainly it would have been better for these things to have been achieved by other methods; just as it would have been better had there been no oppression, no slave trade, no serfdom. But we are not living in a world where things could certainly have been what we now wish they had been. What I want primarily to say, however, is that when it is granted that war as such is a plague, it still does no more good to rail against it than it does to rail against an epidemic of influenza.

It seems to me that there are two sensible attitudes toward the problem of war. One is that of striving diligently to find ways of removing the causes of war and of adjudicating disputes where the causes are not yet or may never be removed. The other is that of granting the justice of war in situations where the fortunes of human liberty are at stake. War is preferable to slavery. While at times one may weigh the choice between the greater and the lesser good, at other times one must weigh the choice between the greater and the lesser evil. It is good eloquence to say "as between two evils, choose neither." But often the refusal to choose is to throw one's weight on the side of the greater evil.

3. *The Question of the Nature of Neutrality.* In international law neutrality means the claim of a nation

that it is neither for nor against either or any of the nations participating in a war; and that it will trade freely with all the nations engaged in the conflict. This official position of a neutral nation is of course modified in fact by all sorts of circumstances over which it has no control and by self-imposed limitations designed to safeguard its own interests or those of its nationals. As to whether this official neutrality helps or hinders any particular belligerent depends on circumstantial situations which are theoretically no concern of the neutral power. By and large this is probably the wisest and safest position for the non-warring nations to take in situations where only minor issues are at stake.

Difficulties arise, however, over the fact that official neutrality does in effect give advantages to one or the other side in the conflict. Consequently nations are often disposed to become unneutral in order to help or hinder causes that they approve or disapprove, or to insist with vigor on neutrality when it serves such purposes.

The truth of the business is that the world is so interrelated today that while we may recognize and even insist on official neutrality, we cannot in fact be neutral. Whatever a nation does or does not do internationally has a bearing on issues the outcome of which concerns all nations. Therefore, a nation cannot be unconcerned over the effects of its official policy.

4. *The Question of "Taking Sides."* Since what a nation does or does not do in fact has an effect on its fortunes and on the future of what it regards as most important in the world, it is little wonder that present-day wars tend to become world wars. The day of isolation is rapidly coming to an end.

There will, of course, always be minor disputes between nations that have a minor bearing on other nations. But in general it can now be said that issues have arisen that are of such nature that the outcome cannot be said to be of no concern to so-called neutral nations. Such an issue is that between the democratic tradition and the rapidly developing totalitarian systems of Europe today. Here is an issue on which peoples will "take sides," and on which their nations will be compelled to "take sides."

We in America are not exempt from this choice. And the real issue is whether we are for democracy with its tradition of power derived from the people and exercised with regard for constitutionally guaranteed liberties, or for the totalitarian system with its arbitrary power exercised without regard for liberties of any sort. I do not think there is much doubt about where the American people stand.

Fortunately we are in a position in the current struggle where for the present at least—and let us hope permanently—we can maintain official neutrality and at the same time lend material aid to democracy. This is the real meaning of "lifting the embargo."

Armistice Day and World Peace Day

S. O. LEVINSON

Should Armistice Day be abolished, or its name changed to Peace Day?

There can be but one answer and the same answer to this double question, namely, No. There is a right way, however, it seems to me, of getting at this thing. To attempt to abolish Armistice Day or to change it would be bitterly opposed by the English, French, and Belgian soldiers and by the whole body of legionnaires in this country. They regard Armistice Day as their day, as representing the ideals for which they offered up their lives, and hence the effort would be not only unjust; it would be impossible of accomplishment, in my humble opinion.

Let us take an analogy. Suppose someone in this country suggested the abolition of Decoration Day. To my mind that would be more logical than to abolish Armistice Day, because the North and South have been long re-welded together and have greater harmony of comradeship and government than ever in our history. And yet such a proposal would fall short of the nearest earshot. All these things seem to me to be born of extreme emotion and in a desperate desire to do everything conceivable to condemn war as it stands in history and fable. War will be abolished not by indirection, but because it is the greatest evil in civilization and the greatest menace to it. When genuine statesmen rule the nations, they will transfer the sacrifice of destructive war to the constructive ends of durable peace. They will stop wasting ten billion dollars a year in peacetime arms construction and contribute instead one billion dollars a year for the welfare of the peoples of the poorer nations. Thus, they will change force to food and loathing to clothing.

I can see how Mr. Hitler would enjoy the abolition of Armistice Day. He would consider it an apology for having defeated his country and a belated moral reparation. If that is to be the purpose, namely to placate Hitler, it should be plainly stated.

I have heretofore informally proposed a World Peace Day, namely August 27th. I have intended, when the available day makes its advent, to call on the Norwegian Minister and have him take it up with his Government, because Oslo with its Storthing and Nobel Peace Prize would be the logical and proper place to propose such a World Peace Day. It would annually celebrate among the nations the agreement signed on August 27, 1928, by the nations, stating in direct terms that never again would force be used in the settlement of their disputes or controversies. No signatory has ever attempted to withdraw from this Treaty. The fact that August 27th is in the middle of summer does not militate against it because hundreds of thousands of Americans normally are in Europe at that time and Europe is the place to establish peace and to celebrate and honor a genuine World Peace Day. The western hemisphere will gladly follow suit in any way required.

How Many More of Our Subscribers Will Do Likewise?

Editor of UNITY:

I am enclosing a check for use in enlarging UNITY's subscription list. . .

I am glad UNITY is ready for this campaign. We read it always with great interest and think it will be a most educational and inspirational organ of pacifism.

G.

Tulsa, Oklahoma.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

III

The *Williams Record,* undergraduate newspaper at Williams College, Massachusetts, reports a war-poll of faculty and students. Fifty-six per cent of the six hundred students voted that they would not approve a declaration of war against Germany, even if it became apparent that Great Britain and France were losing the war. Seventy members of the faculty, polled on this same question, voted thirty-one in favor of a declaration of war under these circumstances, twenty-seven against, and twelve undecided.

In answer to a question asking what personal position they would take in case of war, ninety-three students and three professors said they would go to jail rather than enter military service.

Opposition to war rather than national self-interest should be the basis of American neutrality, states the National Lutheran Council:

> "Self-interest," the statement says, "must not be accepted as the supreme and sufficient arbiter of national policy; neither ought we to be influenced by nationalistic sympathies and prejudices. Rather our determination to maintain American neutrality must be the result of high and costly motives; not for physical safety, not to maintain an impossible isolation from world problems, not for economic gain, but rather because we have witnessed the utter futility and degradation of war, because war is power politics to the nth degree, because war breeds dissatisfaction and hatreds which bring new and ever more terrible conflicts."

The *Christian Century* publishes the following:

> Tension between his convictions as a pacifist and his obligations as a member of the clergy of the state church in a nation at war has led Canon Stuart Denton Morris to renounce his clerical orders. Canon Morris became the successor of "Dick" Sheppard nearly two years ago as head of the Peace Pledge Union. His position is that of a consistent and thoroughgoing pacifist who believes that, regardless of the righteousness of the cause, no good result can be attained by a resort to violence. Explicitly his action, in not only resigning his canonry at Birmingham but surrendering his clerical status, was in protest against the attitude of "a great part of the Church of England" toward the European war. But actually it goes a good deal deeper than that. If it had been only the case that a majority of the members of the church, or even that nearly all of them, are in favor of the war and are actively participating in it, one may imagine that he would have felt justified in remaining and fighting the war spirit in the church from the inside. But the Church of England has a very definite connection with the government, and the government is in the war. Canon Morris' commitment to the pacifist position was particularly conspicuous in view of his leadership of the Peace Pledge Union. An officer with conscientious convictions against violence would be in an ambiguous position in time of war, and a pacifist clergyman of a state church is no more happily situated. Others may experience the same difficulty.

The Archbishop of Canterbury: "The policy proclaimed by the Fuehrer is based on force. It must be met by counter-force."

The Bishop of Birmingham: "It is not Christian, nor even religious, to say that FORCE must be met by force."

An Associated Press dispatch reports the 57th meeting of the Presbyterian Synod of New York in Syracuse. In answer to a plea for sympathy with the Allies in this war, the Reverend Freeman Jenny, of Syracuse, said:

> I find myself 98 per cent in disagreement with [this] speech. You can't tear the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," out of the Bible. . . . America, England, France—*we* created Hitler!

The No Frontier News Service, through its Editor, Devere Allen, who is now in Europe, has issued the following statement on the treatment of conscientious objectors and the general pacifist situation in England:

> How many conscientious objectors will the new war reveal? In the United Kingdom during the World War, there were some 16,000, many of whom accepted alternative service but many of whom also refused to do any kind of work they thought would promote war. There were not many in France, and the few that manifested themselves in the Central Powers were speedily and ruthlessly disposed of for the most part.
>
> If a measure of any civilization is perhaps its treatment of sincere war resisters, Great Britain, so far at any rate, is showing a sense of responsibility and calm judgment about its many pacifists. If the war goes over into more bitter phases, perhaps this present tolerance will give way to a severity more akin to that shown by dictated countries. But many pacifists themselves express appreciation for the amount of understanding shown by the authorities, though they state that the tribunals established to hear the pleas of war resisters are often fatuous, increasingly inconsiderate and characterized by little depth of intellectual comprehension.
>
> It is known that two conscientious objectors, at least, have been executed in Germany. In France the distinguished novelist Jean Giono has been imprisoned for "defeatism," though, of course, defeatism is not even a fractional part of his philosophy, which is essentially the same as that put forward in 1914 by Romain Rolland. The French newspapers are filled with thinly disguised reports of arrests and persecutions of "unpatriotic" Frenchmen, and it is a certainty that the growing pacifist movement has been sternly crushed. Even long before the outbreak of war, France, in the name of democracy, was suppressing its pacifist elements.
>
> But in the early days of the war, at any rate, Great Britain has on the whole manifested toward its sincere dissidents a consideration which deserves credit. The veteran pacifist, George Lansbury, has pointed out that Mr. Chamberlain himself, having long been a Unitarian and being made to understand in England what it is to receive a certain amount of scorn for a minority position, has shown a personal understanding of the pacifist point of view which has occasionally caused concern to his more hard-boiled colleagues.
>
> Not only do the authorities thus merit a certain amount of praise for their official attitudes to date, but so do those who have responsibly, and with poise and firmness, upheld in Britain a point of view which will be submerged for the duration of the war, but almost positively will arise with increased vigor once the war is over. Not only are these pacifists maintaining their intellectual position, but they are busying themselves with all sorts of good works, both in an effort to perform any healing function that they can, short of assistance to war, and to convince their fellow-countrymen that in no true sense is their philosophy one of mere negation. Lansbury, for instance, has been heading up a Polish Refugee Fund, particularly to help children.

The tribunals are revealing sufficient numbers of war resisters to surprise those who had convinced themselves that, once the war drums rolled, practically all of the war resisters would fall into line. Canon Stuart D. Morris, Chairman of the Peace Pledge Union, lost no time after the outbreak of the war in making his position clear. "We renounce war," he said, "and refuse to support or sanction another. We cannot sanction this war. We cannot approve of it. We do not believe that it is a just war. We do not believe that it is an inevitable war. . . . Our pledge to humanity must stand. . . . We have always advocated constructive proposals which we still believe could have saved Europe from this tragedy. If we have failed to avert the tragedy of war, we must try to save peoples from the tragedy of another peace similar to the last. . . ."

James Maxton, representative in Parliament of the Independent Labor Party, in opposing the Conscription Bill said, "I enter my protest against the belief that war can achieve things. We are particularly against the view that any good can come to working-class people in any of the countries in Europe as a result of armed force either in this country or any other."

The Executive Committee of the National Peace Council has issued a statement to its affiliated organizations and to all individual sympathizers. "It can never have been of greater importance," it asserts, "that the influence of what we call 'the peace forces' should be maintained to its fullest extent than it is at this moment of war. The essential duty, therefore, of the peace movement and of the individual peace worker is at all costs to maintain unimpaired the vision of a peaceful and coöperative world, to resume with a new dedication of spirit the task of reconciliation, and to labor unceasingly in the encouragement of every effort aimed at the promotion of a constructive peace."

Expressing penitence for the "failure of its efforts to commend the Gospel of Christ's redemptive love and suffering as the more excellent way," the Council of Christian Pacifist Groups, through Canon Charles E. Raven, Henry Carter and G. H. Macgregor, has published a statement on the war which goes on to declare: "It is manifest that in these last days a spirit vastly different from that of 1914 has been revealed. Many in all nations, if they are not yet ready for the renunciation of their lust for power and reliance on violence are deeply convinced of the wickedness and folly of war; of its destruction of all the true values of life; of its challenge to the personal and ecumenical claims of Christ's religion. Whatever the outcome in terms of national victory or defeat, the issue will be determined by the extent to which the fruit of the Spirit is fostered or corrupted. We see that today this conviction is felt far outside the ranks of professed pacifists."

If the various belligerents really wish to impress neutral coutries with the superiority of their cause and conduct, one yardstick that will be applied to their professions, both by thousands of pacifists all around the world and by many who are not pacifists, will be the degree of their civilized responsiveness to such sincere appeals and activities as these. Thus far, assuredly, Britain, if far from perfect, nevertheless comes off comparatively with honor.

In the *United Church Observer,* published in Toronto, Canada, we find a remarkable statement opposing the European war, signed by sixty-eight ministers of the United Church of Canada. As we read this statement, we should keep in mind that *Canada is at war:*

Since our Church has officially recognized the legitimacy of the anti-war conviction as one which may sincerely and conscientiously be held by Christians, and as we know there is a considerable number of ministers and others who have come to this considered position, and believing that on the whole it would be better that a declaration of such conviction should be made now rather than later, we, the undersigned, present the following statement of our faith and commitment, with an invitation to any others throughout our Church who share our point of view and feel led to avow the same, to forward their names for later publication.

We find ourselves, not without pain and regret, unable to approve of this war. We recognize that other ministers and church members, equally sincere, differ from us and feel in duty bound to participate in it. At the same time we know that we represent a body of conviction characteristic of the earliest Christian Church, and of many reform movements through the centuries, and strongly held by many groups in the churches today.

We take our stand upon the declaration of our own General Council in 1938, that "war is contrary to the mind of Christ," and "we positively reject war, because war rejects love, defies the will of Christ, and denies the worth of man." The Council endorsed the statement of the Oxford Conference of 1937 (the nearest thing to a pronouncement of universal Christendom that has ever been made) which, starting from the recognition that war is sin, agreed that the judgment of individual Christians may lead some to refuse all participation, while others may feel that they must participate when they think a given war to be "just," or when the state orders them so to do. In brief, some will say, "Yes, war is sin; *therefore* . . ."; while others will say, "Yes, war is sin; *but* . . ." While freely admitting the right of our brethren to choose differently, we confess that the following considerations appear to us to have decisive weight.

The will and Kingdom of God must take precedence over the national convenience or policy.

The nature of modern war is such that it is and must be incompatible with the Christian spirit and aims.

Beyond the immediate and apparent causes of war we have to take account of the historical causes, and when we do we find that no nation is black or white, but all share in responsibility for creating the situation which makes war inevitable.

Apart from religious scruples, and apart even from the specific teachings of Jesus, we agree with men like Baldwin and Chamberlain, who have said in effect that war is futile because incapable of achieving any worthy solution of international disputes, and can only bring general destruction.

We remember that the Churches lost heavily in spiritual authority because of their general surrender to the war spirit in 1914-18. We think it ought to be placed on record now, in view of the further loss of spiritual authority probable if the Church sanctions this present war, that at least some representatives of the Christian Churches disapproved and uttered their protest.

It is generally agreed and confessed that Christendom has through the centuries sadly and seriously fallen short in faithfulness to Christ. We are convinced that at no point has Christendom departed so radically from the mind of Christ and its own original faith as in its acceptance of war.

We affirm that we are not seeking escape from the burden or sacrifice, and we profess our readiness to implement our citizen-loyalty in some form of service equally as taxing, difficult, and dangerous as military service, provided it does not contribute directly to the war effort.

They Who Take the Sword Shall Perish with the Sword

Warmongers prate in their council still,
But the young must fight, and the young must kill.

Our homes, our lands, and the dreams we cherish
Consumed in flame, we watch them perish.

Man is the toiler whose willing hand
Furrows the loam and plants the land,

Harvests the crop over river and sedge,
Constructs a road, or builds a bridge. . . .

And greets each toiler as a brother
Till wars arise, then kill each other.

Cease planning, merchants of death! Be still!
One day the young will cease to kill—
Will cease to bend to your bloody will.

FANIA KRUGER

The Study Table

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

A Pacifist Primer

PACIFIST PROGRAM IN TIME OF WAR, THREATENED WAR, OR FASCISM. *By Richard B. Gregg.* 61 *pp. Paper. Published by Pendle Hill, Wallingford, Pennsylvania.* 10 *cents.*

Pacifists and all sympathizers with and students of the peace movement stand again heavily indebted to Mr. Gregg, disciple and friend of Gandhi, and author of *The Power of Non-Violence.* Mr. Gregg has in this case written a pamphlet in which he attempts to answer all possible questions as to what to do in wartime, or under the rule of the tyrannical state. Those whom he addresses are the absolute pacifists of the non-resistant type, and to these he offers specific advice and counsel as to details of conduct in the hour of crisis.

Pacifism he interprets in no merely negative sense. It is not opposition to war or violence. It is rather "an effort to create by non-violent methods a new and better civilization." "War," he points out, "is an important and necessary institution of our present civilization. War is not just an ugly excrescence, or superficial illness, or occasional maladjustment, or temporary personal mistake of a few leaders of an otherwise fair and healthy society; war is an inherent, inevitable, essential element of the kind of civilization in which we live." Therefore, says Mr. Gregg, "pacifism is not just an attempt to postpone any threatened war, not merely to create a permanent condition of non-war. . . . We must build a new order."

This brings the author to his pragmatic theme "if war or Fascism should come or be imminent, . . . what ought a pacifist citizen to do?" His answers to this inquiry are specific, carefully defined, soberly argued, and presented with calm but unimpeachable conviction. They are as follows:

1. Pledge not to fight or help war.
2. If war comes, fulfill the pledge.
3. Work for the new order before war begins and after.
4. Prepare individually and in groups.
5. Refuse to coöperate with war preparations or governmental "alternative service."
6. Pay taxes.
7. Refuse to keep war profits or to buy war bonds.
8. Perhaps join sometimes in patriotic ceremonials.
9. Support strikes against war (but do not foment or initiate them!).
10. Aid the struggle of labor.
11. Refuse to demonstrate with Communists or Fascists.
12. Behave wisely if imprisoned.
13. Plan peace negotiations.
14. Be chary of condemnation always, and of mass protests after war begins. . . . Don't tamper with loyalty of soldiers and sailors.

There are many controversial items in every one of these points. All are stated and argued in detail. Because the last point, of discretion in wartime, is perhaps the most dubious, Mr. Gregg devotes extensive discussion to the various problems involved. The gist of his contention is that, while we must be utterly true to our convictions, we need not be fanatics. We must be ready for martyrdom, but not ourselves seek or provoke it. Always we must try to keep contact with society in relations of understanding and good will, that our influence may be at a maximum and not a minimum of power. There is not a word of compromise in this little volume, nor yet a word of foolishness. We have seldom seen a more perfect synthesis of wisdom and utter fidelity to principle.

A concluding chapter on a "pacifist program under Fascism" is followed by an appeal to "live out your principles." Mr. Gregg would have us to be "doers of the word," and tells us how. And he thinks the challenge a thing of delight and not of doom! "Ahead of you," he writes, "lies one of the most exciting and important tasks in the whole world. It is the new frontier."

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

American Foreign Policy

GIDDY MINDS AND FOREIGN QUARRELS. *By Charles A. Beard.* 87 *pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* 50 *cents.*

I have always regretted the passing of the age of pamphleteering. What is more effective than a pamphlet written red-hot and quickly published on some highly controversial question of the hour? Such pamphlets as used to be issued like bullets in seventeenth century England and France! Voltaire was a master of this type of literature, and so was Thomas Paine. But it has quite disappeared before the nineteenth century flood of newspapers, magazines, and books. Of all the great writers of our time I know of none still expert in this field of pamphleteering but Upton Sinclair.

But here, now, is another—the great historian, Charles A. Beard! This booklet, *Giddy Minds and Foreign Quarrels,* to be sure, was first published as a magazine article, and now is soberly issued in board-covers. But it is essentially a pamphlet, true to type in its timeliness, its clarity, and its passion. Professor Beard is outraged at the influences in this country, including that of the administration, which are now sweeping us willy-nilly into the European war. He shows how for years this nation knew enough to keep out of these continental feuds, of which this present struggle is only the latest and the worst. He tells how a change of American temper and of policy came with the crass imperialism of the nineties of the last century, as led by Theodore Roosevelt, Henry Cabot Lodge, Albert J. Beveridge, and Admiral Mahan. He portrays the betrayal of democracy and of all sound American idealism which was involved in this mad and stupid jingoism. Furious is his attack upon Woodrow Wilson for taking us into the World War and thus encumbering us with disasters from which we have not yet escaped. More furious still is his attack upon Franklin D. Roosevelt for a foreign policy dictated by fickleness, sentimentality, arrogance, sensationalism, a childish love of arms, a dangerous lust of power, and now, at this desperate moment, tragically fated, if it be not changed, to engulf us in the maelstrom of war. What makes this argument impressive is Professor Beard's authority as a historian. He knows something about these matters, certainly as compared with the "brash young tom-tom beaters in journalism, who know no history beyond a few days ago, [and] write books on the 'inside' of this or that."

Professor Beard would have America mind its own business. He would have the country solve its own problems before it attempts to solve the problems of war-torn Europe. He would have it walk not in the paths of Rome or Britain, but along the pleasant ways

of democracy and freedom. Thus can America serve its own interests and mankind's.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Gandhi's Victory

GANDHI TRIUMPHANT. *By Haridas T. Muzumdar. New York: Universal Publishing Company. $1.00.*

Nine months ago, in the midst of a world shaken to its foundations by threat of war, Gandhi of India again held the attention of mankind. This was on the occasion of his latest fast, March 3-7, 1939, in protest against the tyranny of Rajkot, which the author of this book believes to have "firmly laid the foundation of . . . the United States of India."

Recognizing the great significance of this event, and the sweeping triumph achieved by Gandhi in behalf of Indian freedom, Mr. Muzumdar has had the happy thought of telling the tale in outline, and publishing all the important documents bearing upon the episode—Gandhi's articles in his paper, *Harijan,* official letters and agreements, etc. The result is an historical text-book of first-hand and first-class importance. It makes plain what is little known in this country—that the cause of Indian independence is closely entangled with the problem of the native princes, who are themselves mere serfs of the Empire. Britain's backing of Rajkot in the recent controversy was a dreadful scandal.

Mr. Muzumdar is an Indian scholar, who has studied and lived for a period of years in this country. He is a devoted disciple of Gandhi, and was a participant in the famous march to Dandi. He has written and edited other important books on Gandhi and his work, notably *Gandhi the Apostle* and *Gandhi Versus the Empire.* This latest volume is a valuable addition to the list.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

Gandhi's Road to Peace

WAR WITHOUT VIOLENCE. *By Krishnalal Shridharani. 351 pp. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Company.*

It is a striking coincidence that this book on the way to peace as triumphantly travelled by Ghandi of India appeared on the bookstalls at just the moment when the western world was plunging into another war to the death. Whether, in this circumstance, the book will receive the general and serious attention which it deserves may be regarded as doubtful. But let our readers note its great importance as a contribution to the pacifist literature of our time. It is not, as the publisher's jacket describes it, "the first authoritative description" of the Mahatma Gandhi program. This is to ignore Gandhi's own writings now easily accessible, and to forget Richard B. Gregg's *The Power of Non-Violence,* published in 1934 and still very much alive. But Shridharani's work has a unique value of its own, and is to be gratefully added to the indispensable books, all too few in number, which present and vindicate the pacifist ideal.

It is to be noted, at the start, that the author is by no means enthusiastic over our western brand of pacifism. On the contrary, he condemns it as purely negative in character and therefore ineffective in practice. It has no program, he contends, to match the militant program of the warmakers. Denouncing force and violence, it has no substitute to offer for these weapons, with the result that, when violence breaks loose upon the world, the pacifist can do nothing but stand aside and let destruction run its course. The Gandhian ideal, *per contra,* is positive and thus magnificently effective. Called "Satyagraha," it presents a detailed program of procedure which confounds violence, and, as Gandhi and the Indians have proved in their case, leads on to victory without bloodshed, hate, or fear. Here in India today, for the first time in history, we see a great movement for national independence sweeping slowly but surely to triumph, with no bloodshed save that of the martyrs who have chosen not to kill their enemies but to die themselves for the sacred cause of liberty.

The westerner is liable to misunderstand and thus to misinterpret "Satyagraha," as indeed any pacifist movement, because of the unfortunate entanglement of his mind with the Biblical phrase of "non-resistance." There is no non-resistance in Gandhi's work! Rather is there resistance of the most stubborn and heroic type. This Indian pacifism is war—no doubt about that! It is war, aggression, battle, struggle. But it is war without violence, aggression without force, battle without arms, struggle in the spirit not of hate, but of understanding, good will, patient endurance, willing suffering, and courageous sacrifice. The Indian villagers describe "Satyagraha" as "Gandhi's way of fighting the British Raj." More sophisticated Indians speak of it as "a new type of war of which Gandhi is the fountainhead." The author accepts it as "a technique for solving conflict" and "a form of struggle to achieve social ends."

This book is especially valuable in its analysis and elaboration of the technique of non-violent resistance. How is it done? Faced by an enemy to be overcome in a great cause, the Satyagrahite moves step by step through a long process of attack. First, he attempts negotiation with the enemy, to the end of securing an adjustment of difficulties and a settlement of claims by friendly agreement. This is "appeasement," such as Chamberlain attempted with Hitler at Munich. This failing, there comes the next step, which is "agitation" and the stirring of popular feeling. Then demonstrations are held and ultimatums presented. If the enemy is still obdurate, there must come next great ceremonies of "self-purification," to indicate that the enemy is not alone guilty, but that both sides are guilty when a struggle breaks out between them. Then begins the real fight—strikes, boycotts, non-payment of taxes, non-coöperation in the essential relationships of life, civil disobedience, imprisonment, martyrdom, parallel government—the whole organized uprising and resistance, without resort to arms, of an entire people to force, violence, repression, and tyranny. The author shows how this program can be applied in individual life, in the resistance of minority groups to government, in the revolt of communities and even nations against dictators at home and conquerors from abroad. Gandhi tried it in South Africa and again in India, with miraculous success. The author gives copious illustrations of his thesis from Gandhi's experience. Like his master, he contends that it is the method which should have been applied against Hitler in Austria and Czechoslovakia—indeed, may now still be applied!—and is the only method which can save Europe from war and final catastrophe at this hour.

We westerners are a crude people. When trouble comes and we face a dangerous foe, we can imagine only two possible things to do, and both of them on the purely material plane of reality. One is to surrender; and the other is to fight. But there is a third way,

which is spiritual—neither to fight nor yet surrender, but to defy the will of the enemy, to refuse to accept his authority or do his bidding, and to organize, without malice but with resolute determination, a campaign of non-violent resistance against him. Jesus taught this doctrine, St. Francis revived it, Tolstoi proclaimed it; in our own country, Adin Ballou, Henry David Thoreau, and William Lloyd Garrison were its advocates; the Moravians, the Mennonites, and the Quakers have practiced it in the Christian tradition. But it has been left to Gandhi, backed by the mystic genius and discipline of the East, to make it the basis of the most sensationally successful statesmanship in world history. The story of the Gandhi movement, its philosophy, its method—all are here in the pages of this book, to be read by the glare of the European conflagration.

Mr. Shridharani is himself an Indian and a friend of Gandhi. He marched with the Mahatma to the sea in the great campaign of 1930! His book is opened by an exceptionally able and informing introduction by Oswald Garrison Villard, and brought to a close by eight pages of selected bibliography. It is a volume indispensable to every student of the world's thought and life in this tremendous age.

◆ ◆ ◆ ◆

The Great Reactionary

G. K. CHESTERTON. *By Maurice Evans.* 157 *pp. Cambridge, England: University Press.*

There are many readers who believe that Gilbert K. Chesterton was a far greater writer than his contemporaries ever recognized. Perhaps it was because he was so ardent a journalist and presented so much of his material in fugitive form, that he was underestimated in his time. Perhaps it was because he was in open revolt against our age, not as a revolutionist who would plunge forward into some far Utopia of the future, but as a reactionary who would go back to the Catholic order of the Middle Ages, that he was often not taken seriously. Perhaps it was his idiosyncratic style, his persistent paradox, which baffled and disturbed us. In any case, Chesterton received not his due, and died unappreciated in terms of immortality.

But as the years pass, his greatness looms, even as his physical bulk loomed upon London streets in his busy lifetime. His sheer versatility as an author was amazing. Thus, as a journalist he was brilliant beyond compare. His critical biographies—Dickens, Browning—still stand supreme. His essays were the best of his age. His novels and short stories created a *genre* of their own, which constitutes a distinct chapter in the history of English literature. As for his poems, they are like the balladry of old time, all song and color and action. There are certain of these poems which we believe to be as sure of permanent survival as anything written in this century. What a pen this man wielded! Kipling, Bennett, Wells, Galsworthy, Barrie, Masefield, Yeats—Chesterton ranks with the best of them.

For those who admire G. K. C., and for those who would learn to admire him, this little book is indispensable. It is unpretentious, but thoroughgoing and authoritative. Critical appreciation is keen and discriminating. The whole field of Chesterton's range is covered, and every detail illuminated. Especially fine is the interpretation of Chesterton's religious orthodoxy and his conversion to the Roman Catholic Church. From the literary standpoint, the chapter on "The Poems" is the best part of the book. Mr. Evans deserves applause, which is here gratefully given.

THE FIELD

(*Continued from page* 86)

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem is built.
Malaria stamped out.
Eye disease eradicated.
Great medical center erected.
Hospitals, Child Welfare Centers, Clinics established, with provision for nurses and midwives.
Road building for omnibus and motor traffic.
Water supply for Jerusalem.
Organization of railroad system.
Building of Tel Aviv Harbor.
Reading Electric Plant.
Extracting minerals from Dead Sea.
Harnessing Jordan to yield power.
National Library with 400,000 books.
Planting millions of trees.
Developing great theatres.
Establishing internationally famous orchestra.
Tremendous growth of citrus production, and industrial enterprise. In 1929-30 value of oranges, grapefruit and lemons exported by Jews was $1,500,000. In 1936-37, $10,500,000.
In the same period the production of Jewish industrial enterprise rose from $12,500,000 to $40,500,000.

All of these accomplishments have been to the advantage of the Arab. He has increased in Palestine more than in any Moslem country in the world. His birth rate in Palestine is the highest and his death rate the lowest.

Palestine supports 1,420,000 population on 12,200 square miles, as compared to Iraq, for example, which supports 2,860,000 on 143,000 square miles.

It is apparent that in the remaining more than 99 per cent of territory there is ample room for expansion.

In light of these facts, when the Jew persecuted and harassed, driven without mercy from his home, helpless, penniless, cries out to have a chance to live, we say the answer is Palestine.

Christian Friends of Palestine,
Woodward Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hitler's Big Mistake

It has taken a war to show Hitler one of his greatest mistakes in his treatment of the Jews and other minority groups. In driving these people from the Reich, he was supposedly making the land "pure" for his "Aryan" followers. But what Hitler did not realize was that he was also driving from his country the brains that were vital to the progress of Germany.

Some of the greatest scientists, physicists, and medical men of Germany were Jewish. They were forced to leave their homeland, taking with them their wealth of knowledge. And now, with war a reality, there is a real shortage of physicians and scientists to carry on a vital branch of war activity. The German high command wants Jewish doctors and scientists to return to the Fatherland, with promises of immunity from persecution.

It has been thus with every ruler who has mistreated and driven out the Jew. It is not the loss of flesh and blood which counts—it is the loss of the great minds, the culture, the learning.

There will come a time when the German people will bitterly regret the loss of its Jewish population. When Germany is defeated and in shambles, as it certainly will be, then will the German people need the culture, the money, the learning of the Jewish people to rebuild their land. Then will the German people learn the terrible nature of the penalty imposed by Hitler on themselves, not on the Jewish people, when he drove Jews out of Germany. The day of reckoning will find an humble German people anxious to rebuild its torn land on the beneficent culture of the Jewish race.

The Western Jewish Advocate.